

CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Project Name:	YELLOWSTONE PIPELINE HDD CLARK FORK RIVER - Mile Marker 296.3 & 313.5
Proposed Implementation Date:	Fall 2016
Proponent:	Yellowstone Pipe Line Company
Location:	SE4NE4 Section 21, T11N - R15W; NE4NW4 Section 18, T12N - R17W
County:	Granite & Missoula

I. TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ACTION

The Yellowstone Pipe Line Company (YPL) is proposing to construct two new 10" pipeline crossings of the Clark Fork River in the Nimrod (MP296.3) and Turah (MP313.5) areas upstream of Missoula, MT utilizing Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) technology. These new crossings are part of a proactive program the company is making to replace existing trenched pipeline river crossings where they have found the depth of cover over pipes to be insufficient. The purpose of the project is to reduce the potential for the active pipeline to become exposed in the river and thereby minimize the risk of potential for service disruptions, hazardous materials spills, and public safety issues. The Yellowstone pipeline carries refined petroleum products (various grades of gasoline, diesel fuel and jet fuel).

The two crossings would involve the drilling/boring of new 710 and 740 foot segments of pipeline under the river. Each crossing would be located at a depth of more than 20 feet below (approximately 40 feet below the thalweg) of the main river channel, and would be well below potential river scour depth. Use of HDD boring technology is intended to avoid disturbance to the bed and banks of the river. Both drill entry and exit points are located away from the river banks but are within the 100 year floodplain. Work areas consisting of between 100 to 200 foot squares would be created at drill entry and exit points. Work areas would take advantage of the existing cleared pipeline right-of-way. Trees and shrubs are adjacent to work areas but would not be disturbed. Vegetation within work areas would not be wholly cleared and disturbed areas would be re-seeded following completion of work. A pit approximately 10' X 15' X 5' deep would be excavated in each work area to contain drilling mud used in the boring process. These pits would be backfilled and reclaimed upon completion of construction. No wetlands are located within proposed construction areas. As part of the project, YPL also proposes to abandon in-place the two existing pipeline segments that are being replaced as they are not currently exposed (current depth of fill over these pipes varies between 3 to 6 feet). Abandonment activities would include purging and swabbing the lines, filling them with a sand/cement grout mixture, and capping the ends. Following abandonment, YPL would continue to monitor these segments, both on-the-ground and by air, to determine if they become exposed. A site specific response plan would be developed in the event of pipe exposure.

The proposed project timeline is to bore the new pipeline crossings under the river in the fall of 2016 and then temporarily shut down the pipeline during the 1st quarter of 2017 to allow for disconnection of the old and re-connection to the new pipeline segments, as well as abandonment of the old segments of pipe under the river.

Montana Code (MCA 70-16-201) provides for state ownership from the low water mark to the low water mark on navigable water bodies. Based on historical evidence, the Clark Fork River is commercially navigable from Deer Lodge, Montana to the Idaho state line. Therefore, the state claims ownership of the riverbed below the low water mark between these two points. DNRC has received two applications for 50 foot wide pipeline easements across the Clark Fork River from the Yellowstone

Pipeline Company for this project involving a total of 0.24 acres of state trust land (0.11 ac Nimrod and 0.13 ac Turah).

II. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

1. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, AGENCIES, GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS CONTACTED:

Provide a brief chronology of the scoping and ongoing involvement for this project.

This project is a small component of a larger ongoing multi-state proactive effort to address pipelines crossing major waterways.

As part of the regulatory process, the Conservation Districts and Floodplain Coordinators in both Granite and Missoula Counties have been contacted. Additionally, the Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation (DNRC), the Montana Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), and the US Army Corps of Engineers have also been contacted.

A Public Notice was published in Missoula County regarding the issuance of a Missoula County Floodplain permit.

Landowners on both sides of the river adjacent to the crossing sites have also been contacted.

A telephone call was made to Brad Liermann and to Ladd Knotek (Region 2 Fisheries Biologists, Montana Department of Fish Wildlife & Parks - DFWP) soliciting their comments. Both biologists were aware of the project and support its implementation; including the proposal to leave in-place (in the river) the abandoned segments of pipeline.

2. OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES WITH JURISDICTION, LIST OF PERMITS NEEDED:

Nimrod (MP 296.3):

US Army Corps of Engineers: Decision is pending; however, it is anticipated that no 404 permit will be required.

Granite County Conservation District: Has determined a 310 permit was not needed for this project.

Granite County Floodplain Coordinator: Has determined a permit is needed. Issuance of the permit is pending.

Montana DNRC – Has determined that an easement is needed. Evaluation of easement is ongoing.

Montana DEQ - A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan has been approved by MTDEQ pursuant to the Construction Storm Water Discharge General Permit. A DEQ 318 authorization for a short term exemption to water quality standards was determined to be un-necessary.

Turah (MP 313.5):

US Army Corps of Engineers: Application was submitted, response was that no 404 permit is required.

Missoula County Conservation District: Has determined a 310 permit was not needed for this project.

Missoula County Floodplain Coordinator: Has determined a permit is needed. Issuance of the permit is pending.

Montana DNRC: Has determined that an easement is needed. Evaluation of easement is ongoing.

Montana DEQ - A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan is approved by MTDEQ pursuant to the Construction Storm Water Discharge General Permit. A DEQ 318 authorization for a short term exemption to water quality standards was determined to be un-necessary.

3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

Four alternatives were assessed by the YPL including:

- 1) No Action, with continued monitoring of fill over the pipelines;
- 2) Construction of new open-cut river crossings involving trenched excavation and backfilling;
- 3) A pipeline reroute involving construction of new river crossings in different locations; and
- 4) HDD drilling/boring of new river crossings immediately adjacent to the current pipeline.

YPL has chosen to submit a proposal for HDD drilling/boring of new pipelines under the river and in-place abandonment of the existing pipeline segments under the river.

In the analysis of this easement grant application, DNRC will evaluate the environmental effects of both (No Action) and the proposed action (Action Alternative). This analysis incorporates by reference, information contained in the two Joint Applications For Proposed Work In Montana's Streams, Wetlands, Floodplains and Other Water Bodies and the associated figures, maps and photos submitted by YPL.

III. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>RESOURCES potentially impacted are listed on the form, followed by common issues that would be considered.</i>• <i>Explain POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS following each resource heading.</i>• <i>Enter "NONE" if no impacts are identified or the resource is not present.</i> |
|--|

4. GEOLOGY AND SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE:

Consider the presence of fragile, compactable or unstable soils. Identify unusual geologic features. Specify any special reclamation considerations. Identify any cumulative impacts to soils.

Existing Conditions:

Soils within the floodplain are mixtures of stratified alluvial sands, silts and gravels. The river channel sediments move and shift with changing flow dynamics and geomorphology of the Clark Fork River. No unique geology was identified in the project area. The DNRC easements are limited to the channel bottom lands below the low water mark.

No Action: No effects

Action Alternative: The proposed horizontal drilling would be over 20 ft. below the existing river channel beds at both locations. The only effects to State Trust lands below the low water mark would be subterranean. There is low potential for adverse direct, indirect or cumulative impacts to soil quality or geology by implementing the proposed alternative.

5. WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION:

Identify important surface or groundwater resources. Consider the potential for violation of ambient water quality standards, drinking water maximum contaminant levels, or degradation of water quality. Identify cumulative effects to water resources.

Existing Conditions: The existing pipeline crossing of the Clark Fork River at MP 296.3 had a minimum depth of cover of 3-4ft. deep below the river channel bed in July 2015. The existing pipeline crossing of the Clark Fork River at MP 315.5 had a minimum depth of cover of 4.25feet.(near the right bank) and up to 6 feet across the remainder of the channel in July 2015 (Phillips 66 memo 9/8/16). The river channel sediments move and shift with changing flow dynamics and geomorphology of the Clark Fork River. The channel banks are generally stable at the crossing sites, yet there is potential that future river scour associated with flood flows or ice scour may exhume and damage the existing pipeline. Because the proposed drill pads will be sited well back from the river, Granite and Missoula County Conservation Districts as well as the US Army Corps of Engineers determined that permits were not needed for the project. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan has been approved by Montana DEQ pursuant to the Construction Storm Water Discharge General Permit.

No Action: The existing pipelines are covered by riverbed deposits, but the depth of cover is less than desired. There is a long term potential risk that future river scour associated with flood flows or ice scour may exhume and damage the existing pipeline. In a rare severe case of damage, the pipeline may be compromised which could result in a spill, or increase sedimentation and channel scour damage to DNRC ownership and alter river geomorphology if not repaired and stabilized.

Action Alternative: Phillip's 66, and by extension YPL, plans a proactive replacement of the pipeline crossings to reduce long term risks. The proposed construction would install two new 10" pipeline crossings that are well below river scour depth, by horizontal drilling under the riverbed that is State Trust Lands. The HDD option does not involve impacts to the streambed or banks. The drill sites are positioned on private lands adjacent to the riverbed, well back from the channel and within the existing right of way. No wetlands are located within the drill sites. Portions of the drill sites for the entry and exit of the new pipeline are within the 100 year floodplain. Temporary erosion control measures would be implemented that conform to; Best Management Practices, the Storm-water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), and meet all other permitting requirements. Project implementation with these mitigations presents a low risk of sedimentation from the drill sites or access roads.

All water needed for drilling and hydrostatic testing would be brought in from off-site and disposed of properly to minimize sedimentation or impacts to water quality. During proposed drilling operations, there is a low potential risk of leakage of drilling fluid/mud to the surface. Drillers would monitor operations for fluid loss and in the rare case that drilling mud migrates to the surface; the material would be immediately cleaned up and properly disposed of. All disturbed areas would be revegetated with a native seed mix that is appropriate for the area and will provide sufficient competition against invasive species establishment. Topsoil and vegetation from excavated temporary water diversion paths would be salvaged and replaced following project completion.

Yellowstone Pipeline plans to abandon the existing pipelines under the river, after completion of the new pipeline. The current pipelines are not exposed and would be purged, swabbed and filled with grout to maintain the capped pipeline section in-place. Without cathodic protection, the grouted pipeline is expected to rust and degrade over time under the riverbed deposits. YPL would be responsible for continued monitoring of the new and abandoned pipelines. Should the abandoned pipelines become exposed in the future, a site specific response plan would be developed to address the situation.

The proposed pipeline replacements with horizontal drilling would provide long term protection from river scour and damage to the pipeline. Leaving an existing cleaned section of pipeline in place would reduce sedimentation or potential impacts to water quality that would be associated with removal of the pipeline within the river channel. The proposed operations present low risk of direct, in-direct or cumulative impacts to water quality compared to no-action.

6. AIR QUALITY:

What pollutants or particulate would be produced? Identify air quality regulations or zones (e.g. Class I air shed) the project would influence. Identify cumulative effects to air quality.

No Action: No effects

Action Alternative: Some temporary exhaust gas emissions and dust would be expected during construction activities; however air quality is not expected to be impacted to any measurable degree. During construction, the contractor would be required to implement environmental quality controls to mitigate effects on air quality. The contractor would comply with any applicable Federal, State, and local regulations concerning the prevention and control of air pollution. Measures would be taken to prevent the start or spreading of fire due to constructions activities. The contractor would use reasonable methods and devices that control, prevent, and minimize emissions or discharges of air contaminates. Equipment that shows excessive emissions would not be operated until corrective repairs or adjustments are made.

7. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY:

What changes would the action cause to vegetative communities? Consider rare plants or cover types that would be affected. Identify cumulative effects to vegetation.

Existing vegetation within the project area is primarily a complex of native upland grasses and river bottom riparian species including cottonwood and willow, riparian shrubs, as well as forbs and grasses. Current noxious weed infestations are a combination of spotted knapweed, common tansy, leafy spurge and houndstongue. Infestations occur along portions of the project area but are outside the low water mark.

No Action: No changes to existing vegetative conditions would occur. Noxious weeds will continue to occur on the banks of the Clark Fork River at the pipeline location site. Levels of infestation will vary depending on level of control measures. No change would be expected to effects on DNRC ownership of the river bed.

Action Alternative: A minimal amount of disturbance to natural vegetation is proposed under the Action Alternative, and would be primarily associated with the development and use of work areas. The location of work areas would take advantage of upland grassland areas as well as the cleared and previously disturbed pipeline corridor. Trees and shrubs occur adjacent to work areas but would not be disturbed. The following Best Management Practices and Conservation Measures would be implemented under the Action Alternative:

Upon completion of ground disturbance;

- Topsoil would be replaced.
- Disturbed areas would be disked.
- Disturbed areas would be grass seeded with a species mix approved by the Conservation District, NRCS and the landowners.

Based on implementation of BMP's and mitigations, there would be low direct, in-direct or cumulative impacts to vegetation or noxious weeds with the proposed actions to DNRC ownership.

8. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS:

Consider substantial habitat values and use of the area by wildlife, birds or fish. Identify cumulative effects to fish and wildlife.

Existing Conditions: Terrestrial

Limited habitats for terrestrial wildlife exist in the project area. Surrounding uplands and riparian habitats likely support a variety of wildlife species. Big game winter range exists in the vicinity of both projects.

No-Action: No disturbance to terrestrial wildlife would occur. No changes to existing habitats would be anticipated. Collectively, no effects to terrestrial wildlife would be anticipated.

Action Alternative: Some short-duration disturbance to terrestrial wildlife could occur. No appreciable changes to existing habitats would be anticipated. No changes to winter range capacity would be anticipated, but some displacement of wintering big game could be possible depending on the timing of the proposed activities. Collectively, negligible effects to terrestrial wildlife would be anticipated.

Existing Conditions: Fisheries

The Clark Fork River supports a diverse fishery. Species present include bull-trout, westslope cutthroat trout (WCT), mountain whitefish, northern pike minnow, longnose dace, longnose sucker, slimy sculpin, brown trout, rainbow trout, brook trout, northern pike and other minor species (MFISH 2016). Both westslope cutthroat trout and bull trout are considered sensitive species by DNRC. Bull trout is a federally threatened species and potential for impacts to this species are discussed in detail in Section 9 below. By reference a Biological Assessment 3/2/2012 was completed for Yellowstone Pipeline Maintenance at Mi. 319 and is appropriate to these project sites.

No Action: The existing pipelines are covered by riverbed deposits, but the depth of cover is less than desired and there is a long term potential risk that future river scour associated with flood flows or ice scour may exhume and damage the existing pipeline, or increase sedimentation that could impact fisheries if not repaired and stabilized.

Action Alternative: The proposed new pipelines would be drilled subsurface for the entire width of the Clark Fork River and there would be no disturbance to channel banks or bed. The existing pipelines would be purged, swabbed and grouted in-place to reduce sedimentation and water quality impacts that would be associated with pipeline removal. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan would be in place during construction to prevent sedimentation impacts to the river. The drill sites are located on adjacent uplands, well away from the river and would have no direct, indirect, or cumulative effect to fisheries.

9. UNIQUE, ENDANGERED, FRAGILE OR LIMITED ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES:

Consider any federally listed threatened or endangered species or habitat identified in the project area. Determine effects to wetlands. Consider Sensitive Species or Species of special concern. Identify cumulative effects to these species and their habitat.

Existing Conditions: Limited habitats for terrestrial wildlife exist in the project area. The project area at Nimrod (mile marker 296.3) is about 0.25 miles from the Nimrod bald eagle nest and the project area near Turah (mile marker 313.5) is about 1 mile from the Allen Creek bald eagle territory; both of these territories have been reasonably productive in the past. In addition to these nesting habitats, perching and foraging habitats exist along the Clark Fork River in the vicinity of the 2 project areas. Outside of the nesting season, the project area provides winter foraging opportunities for bald eagles.

Surrounding uplands and riparian habitats likely support a variety of wildlife species, including common species as well as less common species such as great blue herons, yellow-billed cuckoos, and pileated woodpeckers. Historic great blue heron rookeries occur relatively close to each of the proposed project areas. Proximity to Interstate Highway 90, railroad, agricultural operations, human residences, and numerous other forms of human disturbance likely limits some wildlife use of the vicinity.

No-Action: No disturbance to terrestrial wildlife would occur. No changes to existing habitats would be anticipated. Collectively, no effects to terrestrial wildlife would be anticipated.

Action Alternative: Some short-duration disturbance to terrestrial wildlife could occur. Foraging and nesting bald eagles could be disturbed by the proposed construction depending on timing of activities. The majority of proposed activities would occur during the later fall, which would be expected to occur outside of the nesting period for numerous sensitive avian species that could be using habitats on adjacent ownerships. Some minor disturbance could occur in the early spring when the proposed activities would be finished during a planned pipeline shut down; this disturbance would likely occur prior to the onset of nesting seasons for many avian species in the vicinity. No appreciable changes in bald eagle prey species would be anticipated. No appreciable changes to existing habitats would be anticipated. Collectively, negligible effects to terrestrial threatened, endangered, or sensitive wildlife species would be anticipated.

Bull Trout: Bull trout is a federally threatened species. This reach of the Upper Clark Fork River is a historic migratory corridor for bull trout. Bull trout are rare in the Clark Fork River but may have improved migratory connections to headwaters streams following the removal of the Milltown Dam in 2008. This reach of the river is considered potentially occupied but undocumented bull trout habitat.

Bull Trout- No Action: No immediate changes to the crossing or existing fisheries would occur, but there is a long term risk of channel scour damage to the existing pipeline and sediments due to the less than desired riverbed cover depth over the existing pipeline.

Bull Trout Action: The U.S. Army Corp of Engineers determined this project would not impact the bed or banks of the Clark Fork River and would not require a permit. The proactive replacement of the pipelines at a deeper depth would reduce risks to the pipelines. Water quality would be protected by not removing the existing pipelines. There would be no direct, indirect or cumulative impacts to bull trout, with the proposed horizontal drilling project and subsurface pipeline installation.

10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES:

Identify and determine effects to historical, archaeological or paleontological resources.

No-Action and Action Alternative: *No Effect* to state owned *Antiquities*.

A Class I (literature review) level review was conducted by the DNRC staff archaeologist for the area of potential effect (APE). This entailed inspection of project maps, DNRC's sites/site leads database, land use records, General Land Office Survey Plats, and control cards. The Class I search results revealed that no cultural or paleontological resources have been identified in the APE on state land (Clark Fork River bed). Because the state owns only the bed of the Clark Fork River in the APE, the proposed pipeline replacement project will have *No Effect* to state owned *Antiquities*. No additional archaeological investigative work will be conducted in response to this proposed development. However, if previously unknown cultural or paleontological materials are identified during project related activities, all work will cease until a professional assessment of such resources can be made.

11. AESTHETICS:

Determine if the project is located on a prominent topographic feature, or may be visible from populated or scenic areas. What level of noise, light or visual change would be produced? Identify cumulative effects to aesthetics.

No-Action: No effects

Action Alternative: For a brief, 2 to 3 month, period of time, heavy equipment associated with boring the pipeline might be seen adjacent to the river. There might also be some minor visible disturbance associated with activities along access routes and at work pads. Upon completion of work, disturbed areas would be reshaped and grass seeded with a mixture approved by the Conservation District, NRCS and the landowners.

12. DEMANDS ON ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES OF LAND, WATER, AIR OR ENERGY:

Determine the amount of limited resources the project would require. Identify other activities nearby that the project would affect. Identify cumulative effects to environmental resources

No-Action and Action Alternative: No effects.

13. OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS PERTINENT TO THE AREA:

List other studies, plans or projects on this tract. Determine cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of current private, state or federal actions in the analysis area, and from future proposed state actions in the analysis area that are under MEPA review (scoped) or permitting review by any state agency.

Pipelines such as the Yellowstone pipeline are regulated by the Department of Transportation, Pipeline Hazardous Materials Safety Administration. This project is a small component part of a larger ongoing multi-state effort to monitor, identify and address public safety concerns regarding pipelines crossing major waterways. This project proposal is a proactive response to YPL discovering the depth of fill over the pipelines at these crossing sites has been reduced over the past several years and is now less than what is desired.

IV. IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION
--

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>RESOURCES potentially impacted are listed on the form, followed by common issues that would be considered.</i>• <i>Explain POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS following each resource heading.</i>• <i>Enter "NONE" if no impacts are identified or the resource is not present.</i> |
|--|

14. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY:

Identify any health and safety risks posed by the project.

The purpose of the proposed project is to reduce the potential for the active pipeline to become exposed in the river and minimize the risks of potential for service disruptions, hazardous materials spills, and public health and safety issues. The Yellowstone pipeline carries refined petroleum products including various grades of gasoline, diesel fuel, and jet fuel.

No Action: The existing pipelines crossing the river are not currently exposed (depth of fill over these pipes varies between 3' – 6'). YPL in their statement of necessity wrote; "Although there is sufficient cover over the pipelines at the present, the cover has been reduced over the past several years. As you know, each runoff event creates a new opportunity for scour due to shifting woody debris, and the potential to expose and damage the pipeline. These point scour occurrences are impossible to predict

in a dynamic river like the Clark Fork. There is a low risk of major and prolonged impacts to human health and safety associated with the no action alternative.

Action Alternative: The proposed boring of new crossings would result in the active pipeline being located at a depth greater than 20 feet below (and approximately 40 feet below the thalweg) of the main river channel. The pipeline at this depth would be well below potential river scour depth. The proposed work would be done under controlled circumstances rather than potentially in reaction to an unplanned event that might occur during unfavorable conditions. There is a very low risk of potential adverse impacts to human health and safety associated with implementation of the action alternative.

15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURE ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION:

Identify how the project would add to or alter these activities.

No Action: There is a low potential for unplanned disruption of petroleum product delivery associated with remedial actions that may become necessary to address pipeline exposure in the river. In addition there is a low risk of potential hazardous materials spills and service disruption associated with a breach in the pipeline.

Action Alternative: There would be a short planned disruption in delivery of petroleum products while the pipeline is disconnected from the old pipeline segments and re-connected to the new proposed new river crossing segments. Once re-connected there would be a minimal low long term risk of service disruptions associated with the new pipeline segments crossing the river.

16. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT:

Estimate the number of jobs the project would create, move or eliminate. Identify cumulative effects to the employment market.

No Action: No change

Action Alternative: The proposed project, if implemented, is anticipated to provide short-term work for 5-10 people for a period of approximately 2-3 months. Boring would be expected to occur between October 15, 2016 and November 30, 2016. Disconnection of the old pipeline segments crossing the river and re-connection to the new pipeline sections crossing the river, as well as abandonment of the old crossing segments would be expected to occur in the spring of 2017.

17. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES:

Estimate tax revenue the project would create or eliminate. Identify cumulative effects to taxes and revenue.

No-Action and Action Alternative: No change in tax base and tax revenues would be anticipated with selection of either alternative.

18. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES:

Estimate increases in traffic and changes to traffic patterns. What changes would be needed to fire protection, police, schools, etc.? Identify cumulative effects of this and other projects on government services

No Action: No change. Should the existing pipelines become exposed or breached in the river, there could be an increased demand for government (emergency) services.

Action Alternative: The purpose of this project is to reduce the potential for pipeline exposure in the Clark Fork River. There would be a decreased demand for government services associated with a reduced risk of pipeline damage.

19. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS:

List State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, and other zoning or management plans, and identify how they would affect this project.

No Action: No change

Action Alternative: The proposed boring of two new crossings deeper under the Clark Fork River and abandonment of the existing crossings with minimal cover would reduce the risk of potential damage to the pipeline and possible adverse impacts to the aquifer.

20. ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF RECREATIONAL AND WILDERNESS ACTIVITIES:

Identify any wilderness or recreational areas nearby or access routes through this tract. Determine the effects of the project on recreational potential within the tract. Identify cumulative effects to recreational and wilderness activities.

No Action: No change

Action Alternative: The proposed boring of two new crossings deeper under the Clark Fork River and abandonment of the existing crossings with minimal cover would reduce the risk of potential damage to the pipeline and possible adverse impacts to recreational uses of the river.

21. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING:

Estimate population changes and additional housing the project would require. Identify cumulative effects to population and housing.

No-Action and Action Alternative: No change.

22. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES:

Identify potential disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities.

No-Action and Action Alternative: No change.

23. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY:

How would the action affect any unique quality of the area?

No-Action and Action Alternative: No change.

24. OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES:

Estimate the return to the trust. Include appropriate economic analysis. Identify potential future uses for the analysis area other than existing management. Identify cumulative economic and social effects likely to occur as a result of the proposed action.

No Action: No change

Action Alternative: Granting of the proposed easement would return approximately \$250 to the Public Land- Navigable Rivers trust and approximately \$50 to the state general fund (application fees).

EA Checklist Prepared By:	Name: Robert Storer	Date: 9/23/2016
	Title: Trust Lands Program Manager - SWLO	

V. FINDING

25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:

I select the Action Alternative, granting easements for two buried pipeline segments involving 0.24 acres of State-owned property below the low water mark of the Clark Fork River with recommended mitigations (see below).

Granting these easements will allow for the abandonment of two existing trenched pipeline crossings that currently have less than the desired depth of fill and the new installation of bored pipelines placed well below the potential depth of scour of the river. This action will greatly reduce the risk of these pipeline segments becoming exposed in the river resulting in potential adverse environmental impacts.

Mitigations: I recommend the following stipulations be incorporated into the easements upon concurrence and acceptance by the State Board of Land Commissioners:

- That the existing pipeline segments be abandoned in-place as described in the YPL application materials.
- That YPL continue to monitor the depth of fill over these abandoned pipelines
- That YPL agree to remove the abandoned pipelines should they become exposed.
- That removal work is to be done in strict conformance with regulatory permitting requirements.
- That all costs of pipeline abandonment, monitoring and removal be borne by YPL.

26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:

The Action Alternative will not result in significant environmental impacts.

27. NEED FOR FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:

☐


EIS

☐

More Detailed EA

☒

No Further Analysis

EA Checklist Approved By:	Name: Jonathan Hansen
	Title: DNRC Missoula Unit Manager
Signature: 	Date: 9-26-16

